



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The story of so interesting an experiment should certainly be told; it is fortunate that it is told so well as in *The Clothing Workers of Chicago*. The book, of course, is an *ex parte* statement by the workers; but that very fact lends a peculiar interest to the book, and shows all the more clearly the constructive and intelligent view which the union leaders in Chicago are taking of these interesting developments.

Judge Huggins' book is of a somewhat different nature. Here is a discussion of a similar effort to substitute judicial settlement for war in the industrial struggle; but in the Kansas experiment the machinery is forced by the government upon employers and employees regardless, if not counter to, their wishes; and the arbitrators are not of their own, but of the government's choosing. In many ways, the results have not been as happy as in the Chicago experiment; but perhaps it is only fair to say that the Kansas program is more ambitious and the initial problems more difficult to overcome. In *Labor and Democracy* Justice Huggins, the presiding judge of the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations, discusses in a popular way the problems arising between employer and employee, and their relationship to the rights of the public, and then goes on to show how Kansas has attempted to solve these problems by the creation of the Kansas Court, and how this court is working out a body of case law to define the legal concept of industrial justice.

As a matter of fact, Kansas has not been the pioneer in Industrial Courts. To Justice Higgins of the Australian Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, and to Professor Jethro Brown of the South Australian Industrial Court, must be given the credit for successfully blazing the way in Industrial Court case law. "Labor and Democracy," however, is interesting as showing the ideas of the man who is conducting the first American experiment along this line,—an experiment which the whole nation is watching with no inconsiderable interest.

FRANCIS B. SAYRE.

LIBERTY UNDER LAW, AN INTERPRETATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT. By William Howard Taft. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1922. pp. 51.

This little book, an address by Mr. Chief Justice Taft, is the first of the Cutler Lectures recently founded in The University of Rochester to promote serious popular consideration of points deemed vital to the permanence of constitutional government in the United States. It is a simple and interesting statement of controlling principles, with their present-day applications, rather than a studied discussion or defense of them.

The address pertinently says that the framers of the Constitution adopted the form of the colonial government in giving the Federal Government powers which the English Government retained under the royal charters to the colonies,—but reversed the order. The States and the people became the source of sovereignty; the Federal Government held under a charter of limited powers, and accordingly if its acts exceeded the powers granted, they would be void, as were those of the colonies.

Governments do not create liberties; they preserve, restrain or destroy them. Among peoples living in settled communities there can be no liberty except under law. The Constitution was not framed as an exposition of political theory nor did it aim to control the powers of a nation in the interest of a family or a class, as was done in France in 1852, in Germany in 1871, and as Russia is now attempting to do. The most intelligent and experienced patriots and statesmen devised it to preserve personal liberties that had been won at a heavy cost. They accepted as

basic the statement of the Declaration of Independence that the object of just government is to maintain the equal and inalienable rights of life, liberty and property. They avoided in advance the fatal errors of the theorists of the French Revolution and of the more cruel, blind and selfish theorists, the leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution. They were resolved that the people should be as carefully guarded against the despotic will of a majority as against the despotic will of an English king. They framed a Government of justice, not one of power. And the Constitution still deserves the reverence it received during its first century.

Having sketched the origin and distinctive features of our constitutional government, Mr. Taft briefly shows that certain proposed or accepted changes, such as "parliamentary government," the initiative, referendum and recall, the direct primary, and the abolition of party rule are contrary to the principles of the Constitution and offer no benefit. He argues that the direct primary is detrimental to the best public service, in giving a great advantage to the rich candidate.

The tendency toward class legislation and class action in politics is a grave danger.

"With the native born, as well as with the foreign born," says the Chief Justice, "we must inculcate Americanism in its true sense. The greatness of our country, the freedom it secures its citizens, the equality of opportunity evident in the success of the humblest born and in the leadership of the self-made, must all be enforced as a basis of grateful love of country. But more than all it should be pressed into the mind and soul of every boy and girl, that they are the country, and that as they shall pursue an honest, intelligent, industrious, moral life they will be making for a greater America."

It is by such patriotic service as this by Mr. Taft, that the people can be made to understand the inestimable value of their inheritance and the danger of losing it, if they do not bestir themselves to protect it.

EDGAR A. BANCROFT

AUSTRALIA AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. By A. D. Ellis. Melbourne, Australia: The Macmillan Co. 1922. pp. 62.

This workmanlike and suggestive little handbook does not pretend to be more than an introduction to a subject not only offering new duties and opportunities to the world in general but involving also very special problems for that strange being, the British Empire.

A number of Dominions, whose status and relations within a great political union no document explains, are equal members by definite treaty in an almost world-wide League of Nations. They have many but not all the attributes of nationhood as generally conceived. They have a complete control of their domestic concerns, but of their part in foreign affairs it is impossible to make an acceptable statement. They, at all events, have not been able to agree upon any. Yet before the British Empire can explain itself to itself it sits at the councils of the world at large in one room as an Empire, in another as so many nations. If its neighbors are inquisitive they will discover that the British Empire is one thing, the unit calling itself the British Empire is apparently another. What other? Great Britain has no seat as such in either the Council or the assembly of the League, yet she certainly sends delegates to both bodies. Newfoundland has no seat as such, yet it seems that she is represented by the delegates from Great Britain. It is also possible for any of the British Dominions to be elected to the Council and to sit side by side with the body calling itself the British Empire. Would the part be